RESTORATION REVIEW

It is said that an eagle is capable of flight at very high altitudes, and in the face of an approaching storm need not fly before it, seeking refuge. Instead, it may spread its wings and be lifted by the winds themselves high above the turbulence, where it may circle comfortably in the sunshine until the tempest is abated. Just so, true faith in God makes it possible for the Christian to be borne up by the storms of life to new heights: "They who wait for the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like eagles . . . " *Isaiah* 40:31

Volume 7, No. 8 **October, 1965**

Volume 7, No. 8 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **October 1965**

JUSTICE IN ALABAMA

Two years ago I made a trip around the world, visiting 15 different nations. There were occasions when I was called upon to explain Oxford and Little Rock, Birmingham and New Orleans, along with police dogs and sit-ins. I recall the troubled soul of a Chinese woman in Taipei who had come to hear me speak at a Church of Christ gathering. She simply could not understand how "the leader of the free nations of the world" could have so much racial strife.

Perhaps I caused her to be more sympathetic by a brief review of the Negro's progress in the United States since slavery, and by pointing out that whites as well as Negroes are involved in the civil rights revolution, and that all of this is part of the struggle for freedom, in America as well as elsewhere, for Americans realize that "liberty and justice for all" is an ideal not yet fully realized even in the United States. She appeared to be impressed that I readily conceded that our Negroes are often treated unjustly, and that it is a condition that nearly all Americans hope to correct. I pointed to her own Chinese culture that goes back thousands of years, which nonetheless has always had its racial tensions; and I observed that the United States in the brief span of but one century has assured more rights to its racial minorities than any nation on earth. "So give us another hundred years and see then where the Negro in America is," I asked of her. "These people were slaves one hundred years ago, but now some are university professors, government officials, scientists, professional baseball players, and all the rest. So we are working on it," I said to her.

If I were back in Taipei or New Delhi on this night of September 30, 1965, I would have much more difficulty explaining Hayneville, Alabama than I would Selma or Los Angeles. It is easier for the oriental mind to understand the intemperance of the man of the street than the miscarriage of justice in a court of law. Even the assassination of a president is less perplexing to a foreigner than the exoneration of a murderer in, a court of justice.

It is now a matter of record, yea even *judicial* record, that Thomas L. Coleman, a deputy sheriff in Hayneville, leveled his shotgun on two gentlemen of the cloth and blasted them, killing one and seriously wounding the other. He was tried for manslaughter rather than for murder, because it was supposedly without malice aforethought. If he were found guilty, the sentence would have been from one to twelve years in prison. But he is tonight a free man"free" in the sense that he will not even go to prison. But as Eric Sevareid said on CBS News: "He goes to a different kind of prison: the prison of his own conscience, which is with him in the night. And to this prison he has been sentenced for life."

It is a sad day for our blessed Land when justice is absent in our courts of law. Perhaps a Lee Harvey Oswald can be explained, but how do you explain a magistrate of justice who refuses to postpone a trial so that the star witness (the hospitalized clergyman who was unable to testify) can give his testimony? And how do you explain twelve jurors who free a man who shoots unarmed men? It is a dark day for America. I fear the judgment of God upon our nation if we are to have more of this. It was against such gross wrongs in high places against the weak that the prophets of Israel spoke.

I may not even try to explain to a Chinese or an Indian how such as this could ever happen in the United States, but I can and I must, for the sake of conscience, express my protest and indignation. And so I am sending the following letter to Mr. C. E. Yates, Jr., Hayneville, Alabama, who was the foreman of the jury. Or one might write to Judge T. Werth Thagard, Circuit Court, Hayneville, Alabama, to whom I plan to send a copy of this editorial. Millions of protests should thunder forth from an indignant nation. We must not allow a cold-blooded murderer, twelve cowards, and an unfair judge to desecrate justice without protest.

Mr. C. E. Yates, Jr.

Hayneville, Alabama

My dear Sir:

Like many other of our countrymen, I am shocked and incensed by the miscarriage of justice that occurred at your hands in your city on this last day of September, 1965. It is surely a day that will live in infamy in the history of Alabama, a state in which I also have lived and worked.

This grave injustice causes me to be ashamed to be of the white race and to be an American. I am ashamed of you and your fellow jurors, and I pity your sense of justice. That you would exonerate a murderer is despicable, and you must now assume your place alongside him at a trial that all thirteen of you have yet to face — *the judgment of God, the Judge of us all!*

The prophetic utterance of Amos needs to ring through the streets of Hayneville and in the hearts of twelve jurors who revealed that they fear men more than God:

"You have turned justice into poison and the fruit of righteousness into wormwood."

Sincerely,

LEROY GARRETT

THE POPE'S VISIT

As we go to press with this issue the nation makes ready for the first visit of a pope of Rome to the United States. While the visit of the head of the Roman Catholic Church to a so-called "Protestant nation" may be expected to be a controversial event, it is certain that our country will respond with more enthusiasm than it would have a generation ago. That his mission is for peace rather than for ecclesiastical purposes, that he comes to plead for goodwill among men before the United Nations rather than to ordain cardinals at St. Patrick's, lifts his visit above partisan criticism.

Any person in a position to influence the minds of upward of a half billion people is to be taken seriously by all the rest of us, especially when that person has absolute authority over the thinking of these people in all matters of *dogma* and *morals* (terms that include most everything as they are interpreted by the Roman Church). This is true of kings, presidents, and magistrates as well as serfs and peasants, and the fact is that scores of heads of state look to the Holy See as the highest human tribunal.

This position of incredible power could well make the pope the most important person in the world, not to mention the fact that he is the chief executive of the richest and largest organization in the world, with the possible exception of the United States Government, which may be richer, though not larger. He is the only man in the world before whom both kings and serfs do obeisance.

All this makes it extremely important what this man *thinks* and *believes*, and what values he cherishes. If it is important to me what my next door neighbor believes, and what he teaches his children, who in turn play with my children, then it is important to me as to what manner of man the pope is, who influences the morals of hundreds of millions of people.

For hundreds of years the popes have been shut up in the parochial environment of Rome, surrounded by old prelates hardened by tradition and limited by a hierarchy immune to change. Not only have the popes all these many years been Italians, but they have restricted themselves to Italy during their pontificates. They have consequently fallen behind the on-rushing world, refusing to change because of a fear of change.

Pope John, during his short rule, changed all this by "opening the windows of St. Peter's to the world," as it has been put, and he no doubt would have ventured out into that world had he lived. Pope Paul has gone on to "open the doors of St. Peter's" and has

moved out into a broader ministry than any pope in history. Already he has visited the Holy Land and India, and now he visits the United Nations and the United States. He may next go to Poland behind the Iron Curtain. In all these places he is in contact with world leaders who have backgrounds much different from his own. He has met as an *equal* with both the archbishops of Canterbury and of the Greek Orthodox Church, as well as other representative clergy of all major faiths.

This cannot help but effect a man. He not only gets a better view of our troubled world, but he enters into dialogue with men who differ with him theologically, but who share with him a concern for peace. All this tends to thrust him forth as a leader of a wonderfully diverse world culture rather than a monolithic ecclesiastical institution. Such a diverse culture can follow only a leader who has both depth and breadth.

If all this produces a more liberal pope, one who will grow ‘Weary of the medieval ways of his church, and thus insist on the changes that are long past due, it will be a great blessing to the world. With this hope in view I can endure with some patience some of the trapping that goes with a papal visit that I don’t especially like, even to the point of defending it all before a wife who complains about “all the fuss going on over the pope.” And defending a papal visit to the United States really doesn’t sound like me. Maybe I *have* lost my faith!

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

BILLY GRAHAM, THE NEW BIRTH, AND BAPTISM

This journal has from time to time commended the fine work that Billy Graham is doing in proclaiming Christ to millions of lost souls. This has significance in view of the fact that this paper circulates among people who are generally less than enthusiastic about Graham’s preaching. Most of those with whom I have labored in the Church of Christ would hardly acknowledge him as a gospel preacher, yea, he would be considered as much a subject to the plan of salvation as set forth by my brethren as any other sinner. He is in their view a *Baptist* preacher, not a *gospel* preacher. I am in a position to understand their point of view, for once held to it myself.

To be sure, it was in 1953 when Billy Graham was in Dallas at the Cotton Bowl that several of us made a raid on the place, handing out thousands of tracts over Graham’s protest. I wrote about this in *Bible Talk,* which was the predecessor to this journal, in these words:

> The crowd was somewhat smaller than usual in the Cotton Bowl on the night of June 17. Word was passed to Billy Graham that some people were stationed at the entrances of the stadium with tracts to hand out. Billy got up and advised the crowd to the effect that

> "unsanctioned literature" would be handed out and that they might very well pass it by. Billy should have known not to have said that to a crowd of Texans. He could not have better advertised the tracts. Hundreds went out of their way to get the "unsanctioned" literature. Twelve humble saints passed out nearly 4,000 copies of *Bible Talk* in a few minutes time.
>
> The reaction was electrifying! Inquiries by the dozens came by way of telephone and the mails. So successful was the mission that the gospel workers went back two more nights to hand out other gospel literature — some 7,000 pieces in all! The literature was designed to show the difference between the preaching of Peter in Jerusalem and that of Graham in Dallas. The people seemed to have caught the point. They are going to be wondering why the modern "God's ball of fire" does not tell sinners today what the apostles told them in the beginning of Christianity.

My purpose now is not to take back what I said then. As I read again the material that we distributed at the Cotton Bowl, I find myself giving three cheers for the effort, even though as one grows older he supposes he knows how to say better what he said years before. While I still make the same criticism of Graham's work that I did then, which is that he does not instruct those who make "decisions for Christ" to be immersed as the New Testament teaches, I now have a deeper appreciation for his work as a whole than I had then. Too, I said things in those tracts that were less than tactful, and perhaps less than true. For instance:

> Two things are immutable about a Billy Graham revival: (1) There is sure to be a collection taken, and (2) It is certain that Billy will *not* tell sinners what Simon Peter told them. It cost nothing for Peter to preach a full gospel in Jerusalem, but it cost Dallas hundreds of thousands for Billy to preach a *different* gospel in the Cotton Bowl.

It would have been just as well had I not said that. I suppose it is true that in every Graham Crusade a collection has been taken, but there is nothing inherently wrong in that; and it is true that Graham has put himself on a reasonable salary. I am sure it is also true that he never tells people that the scriptures teach them to be immersed into Christ (even though he himself *is* an immersed believer), and this criticism I must still make. But it is wrong to say that he preaches a *different* gospel. I take that back, and I am sorry I said it, for he certainly does preach the same gospel Peter proclaimed, which is man's victory over sin through the risen Christ. And I rejoice that he proclaims this blessed gospel!

I deeply regret that he consistently avoids spelling out the terms of pardon, or the conditions of obeying the gospel, as Peter does in Acts 2:38. I pray for Billy Graham and his work more now than I did back in 1953, and I can truthfully thank God for the great work he is doing. But I also pray that his work might be made more effective for the kingdom of God by a more faithful adherence on his part to the place of immersion in the scheme of redemption.

One is reminded all over again of the beloved evangelist's steadfast refusal to say anything about baptism when he reads "The New Birth", written by Graham for *Christianity Today,* issued with the September 10 number of that journal as a separate booklet of 24 pages. Even though this is an extensive treatment on becoming a Christian, there is hardly a single reference to baptism. One wonders if this means that Graham considers baptism wholly irrelevant to the subject of the new birth.

There are instances where it appears that he actually *goes out of his way* to avoid any reference to baptism. It is indeed puzzling to me that this would be the case, for his circumstance as an evangelist supported by churches that differ on baptism does not necessitate a total avoidance of the subject. He could at least quote the relevant text and leave it to the people to interpret it as they see fit.

For instance, he quotes Acts 2:37 in his essay, showing how the people asked Peter about salvation, but he ignores the next verse, which gives Peter's answer to the question. He quotes Acts 16:30 where the jailer asks, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" This time he gives Paul's "very simple answer" (wasn't Peter's also simple?), which points to faith in Christ, but makes no mention of the jailer's baptism within the same hour. He even quotes the eunuch's question to Philip as "What doth hinder me?" when the eunuch really said "What doth hinder me *to be baptized?"* In the same way he quotes John 3:3, where Jesus says that a man must be born again, but there is no reference to verse 5 where Jesus says: "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." So it is with Lydia. He does say of the woman from Thyatira: "She opened her heart, believed, and was converted without struggle or conflict" (Is *conversion* something more than *belief?).* But again no reference to the fact that she too was immersed of Paul at once.

But more than all of this one is dismayed to find the evangelist so willing to pass up an opportunity to tell his readers what "the Bible says" about baptism. Notice him here: "The question that comes to many minds is this: Just what must I do actually to receive Christ? I wish it were possible for me to wrap it up in a neat little formula and hand it to you, but that is impossible. Just as there are no two snowflakes alike, there are no two experiences with Christ exactly the same."

Did not the people on Pentecost ask an apostle of Christ that very question? Whether we call it "a neat little formula" or not, it does tell believers how to receive Christ! "And Peter said to them, 'Repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit:"

We can all appreciate Graham's emphasis upon the diversity of experience that people enjoy in coming to Christ. This is evident in the very cases of conversion that Graham refers to: Lydia, the jailer, the Pentecostians, and the eunuch all had different experiences to tell. But what the evangelist fails to notice is that *a few things were common with them all.* They all believed in Jesus as the Messiah, repented of their sins, and were immersed

into Him. Why does the evangelist consistently avoid what is so obviously scriptural. He might well consider giving the people "a neat little formula" such as Jesus gave His apostles: "And he said unto them, 'Go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned.'" (Mk. 16:15-16)

My prayer to God is that the evangelist will quote these passages that *do* tell sinners what to do to be saved, *without comment,* if he wishes, leaving it to the people to interpret as they will.

It remains something of a mystery that Graham is as indifferent as he is about immersion in the scheme of redemption at a time when there is a revival of concern for this subject among leading theologians, men that Graham has learned to love and respect through his European contacts. Men like Karl and Marcus Barth, Emil Brunner, and Erich Sauer are not to be ignored, and they are calling for a restoration of baptism in Christian preaching.

It could be that those of us who labor within the Restoration Movement are partly responsible that evangelists like Billy Graham, who very properly wish to stress the grace of God, shy away from any mention of baptism lest they suggest that man is saved by his own works. We have opposed the idea of "justification by faith *only"* with such zeal that we have left the impression that it is indeed by one's own acts that he gains salvation. This cannot be, for it is only by God's grace that anyone will be saved, and because of this we too can insist that salvation is by faith *only.*

But this does not mean that there is not a *response* to faith, a principle that is found all through the Bible. It is always a *responding* faith that saves, whether Abraham *offering* his son, Namaan *dipping* in a river, the Israelites *marching* around walls, or the Philippian jailer being *immersed* the same hour of the night. It is improper to say that these acts saved them, for it was *faith* that saved them through God's grace. But it was a responsive faith.

It is by God's grace that we have an act by which to respond. If He had not named something, we should have sought for such, for we need something (and should *want* something) that we can do to express the feeling of our heart. This explains why the eunuch requested baptism. He believed and he wanted to express his faith.

Alexander Campbell, who remains the ablest spokesman of the Restoration concept in our history, was well aware of the danger of confusing immersion as an act whereby man gains some right of his own to God's favor. For this reason Campbell spoke of baptism as "the cultivation of grace." Here is a concept, once it is properly set forth, that could go far in restoring immersion to its proper place in Christian teaching.

We are not asking Billy Graham to preach baptism. We want him to go on proclaiming the love of God manifested through the sacrifice of the Christ for our sins. God forbid that he should stop preaching the risen Christ and start delivering discourses on baptism. The evangels of our Lord never did such; neither should Billy Graham or any of us.

We ask him rather to preach our Lord with such fervor that men will cry out as they did on Pentecost: *What shall we do?* Let him answer in the same way Peter did, that they are to repent and be baptized for the remission of their sins, and he will then, as did Peter, be setting the terms for *the cultivation of grace*.

The response of faith in baptism may be likened to the cultivation of a beautiful garden. The story of preparing the soil, planting the seed, watering the flowers, and hoeing the weeds is a story of faith. We are tempted to coin a word here — *faithing*. That is what cultivates the garden. The soil, seed, rain, germination, growth are all of God. The garden stands only by God's goodness. But *faithing* was necessary, or call it *a faithful response* to the goodness of God. While the garden is a reality only by God's grace, it is nonetheless true that the faithful response of the gardener was a necessary condition. This illustrates our point that baptism may be viewed as the cultivation of grace.

Questions having to do with how much one must know when he is baptized, whether one is saved before or after baptism, or whether the pious unimmersed are Christians may not be necessary. Differences here may push men to extreme positions in either direction. Let us preach the Christ in all His beauty, and show that it is only by grace through faith that the sinner can be saved. But, like the apostles, let us set forth the terms whereby man can make the loving response of faith to the proclamation of heaven, thus allowing for the cultivation of grace. Then baptism will again be appreciated as it was in the primitive church. — *the Editor*

Postscript

Shortly after writing the above, I heard a brother on a prominent Church of Christ radio program from Dallas make this statement, and these were his exact words: "Salvation is not an entirely free gift, for there is something that man must do." There is no question in my mind that this brother means to be true to the Bible, but we must recognize that this is a gross perversion of the gospel of Christ. It is the same fatal error that has been in men's minds since "the circumcision party" did its deadly work in the first years of Christianity: *the proud notion that it takes more than the grace of God to save a man.*

We have reason to fear that the radio minister's idea that "salvation is *not* entirely a *free* gift" is a common notion among our people. If this is true, then we must conclude that we are without understanding of the vital truth Paul spoke of in Eph. 2:8: "For by grace

you have been saved through faith; and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God — not because of works, lest any man should boast."

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

LOVE: THE KEY TO THE DOOR

Curtis Lydic

In the New Testament scriptures love is presented as the key to successful Christianity. Without it no idea or act retains spiritual meaning; by it one is assured of being able to live in full fellowship with God. "God is love," says John, "and he who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him." Jesus said that all the law and the prophets hung upon the dual commandment to love God and one's fellow man (Matt. 22 :37-40). Peter wrote that "love covers a multitude of sins" (1 Peter 4:8).

We have found it easy to learn the scriptures, and we know what the scriptures say about love as well as about other things. But, as in other things, we may have become so satisfied with knowing the scriptures that we have forgotten the importance of actually going in the way they direct. Some rationalization appears to exist to the effect that knowing what the word says earns us credit just as though we had done what it says. Be that as it may, we have many problems which are with us to trouble us largely because we have not learned the kind of love which would have prevented them. Having these problems, we could shortly solve them if we could learn even at this late date to love one another.

Inability to love is a symptom of carnality, and, in view of the character of carnal man, is quite understandable. It is summed up in the common word, *selfishness.* This refers to man's natural inclination to have his own interests first at heart, and to see himself as in competition with other members of his society. What he does is calculated to insure his own survival, and, as we all know, he often becomes quite willing to sacrifice others to this end. When one achieves a feeling of security he becomes more amiable and generous and relaxed. This is generally the case with us all, who, in small ways, are friendly when we think we can afford it, and reserved when we think we can't. The world is full of dangers for the natural man; competition *is* rugged, and there are threats from all sides (some men will "beat" anyone they can; others do not really wish to "beat" anyone, but will do so to avoid "getting beat" themselves). Only when the carnal man feels that he can trust another not to attack him in some way does he feel free to extend love. Of course, man needs to love and be loved, so he will often risk something for the sake of love, but usually with some trepidation.

Our consideration of the psychological handicaps of carnal man with regard to love is not unrelated to problems within the church; for we see, unfortunately, the same attitudes exhibited in the behavior of one Christian to another. Hence, the strong teaching of Paul's and John's writings to the effect that love must supplant these natural urges if spiritual growth is to ensue. If loving becomes more easy when one attains a feeling of security, and we more easily love those from whom we expect nothing but good, the enlightened Christian should find it possible to fulfill the "royal law" on both counts:

1) His experience with God will convince him that he may expect nothing but good from the Father.

2) An examination of New Testament teaching will show him that no one can take from him the really valuable things he has, for they are spiritual. As he learns to value the spiritual, he will devalue the material and no longer fear for its safety. He will apply the teachings of Jesus (Matt. 6:25-34) and Paul (Phil. 4:6,7) and be content. Thus he will no longer see his neighbor or brother as a competitor and will be free to love him.

Love is sometimes confused with approval. We do not need to hate those whose behavior is repugnant to us. Approval is contingent upon behavior, while love is unmerited and unconditional (that is, the kind of love we learn from the Father). God loved the people of Israel even when he most despised their behavior, and his conciliatory gift of the Son is the irrefutable proof of this.

However, so far as approval is concerned, there is room for enlightenment in the church also. "Do not be conceited," says Paul, "or think too highly of yourself; but think your way to a sober estimate based on the measure of faith that God has dealt to each of you." (Rom. 12:3) This is good advice. The best cure for impatience with others is honest self-examination. If my Father could love anyone so unlovely and unlovable as I, I can surely love others. Besides, they are the children of my Father; I can welcome them for his sake, seeing that he has promised to welcome me for the sake of his Son.

Love may be hard to learn, but it can be done. With honest meditation and prayer, these thoughts might help.

THE ATTITUDE OF A CHRISTIAN IN THE MIDST OF A RACE CRISIS

Rex A. Turner

A Christian cannot scripturally be a pro-segregationist, nor an anti-segregationist. The Apostle Paul lived in a day when slavery as an institution, or way of economic life, had governmental sanction; but he did not express an attitude of pro-slavery nor of anti-slavery in any of his inspired writings.

Paul did give instructions which, if followed, would make the institution of slavery of no real consequence for either the master or the slave. In his epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, especially, Paul dealt with the various relationships that persons sustain with each other.

Beginning with the subordinates, the wives, Paul instructed: "Wives, be in subjection unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord;" but he immediately moved to the ascendants, the husbands, and instructed: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for it." (Eph. 5:22-24.) When wives and husbands follow Paul's instructions, there can be no imbalance, injustice, or real inequality or disparity.

Next, Paul moved to another class of subordinates, the children, and he instructed: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right;" but he again immediately moved to the ascendants, the fathers, and instructed: "Ye fathers, provoke not your children unto wrath: but nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6:1-4.) As with wives and husbands, when children and fathers follow Paul's instructions, there can be likewise no imbalance, injustice, or real inequality or disparity.

Paul then moved to a third class of subordinates, the servants, and he instructed: "Servants, be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart;" but a third time he immediately moved to the ascendants, the masters, and he instructed: "Masters, do the same unto them (i.e. observe the same principles that the servants are enjoined to observe), and forbear threatening: Knowing that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons with him." (Eph. 6:5-9.) Now, as was the case of wives and husbands and the case of children and parents, when servants and masters follow Paul's instructions, there can be likewise no imbalance, injustice, or real inequality or disparity.

Paul's letter to Philemon regarding Onesimus — Philemon's run-away slave, and how that he was causing Onesimus to return to Philemon — illustrates a delicate application of the principle that Paul taught in both the Ephesian and Colossian epistles. The delicate application that Paul made of the principle is a fine point that is worthy of considerable contemplation.

The principle involved in each of the cases cited is humility. Jesus set the example: "He humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross," and for this "God highly exalted him." (Phil. 2:8-9.) As was the case with Jesus, the Christ, so is the case with men today; the way up is down. James said: "Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate: and the rich, in that he is made low." Jesus counseled: "When thou

art bidden to a marriage feast . . . go and sit down in the lowest place . . . for everyone that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." (Luke 14:7-11.)

True enough, slavery is unlawful in the United States. The fine principle involved in the master-slave relationship, however, obtains today in both social and civic relationship of a like nature just as it did in Paul's day. The fine principle involved in the master-servant relationship obtains in such as the employer-employee relationship, the literate-illiterate social relationship, and the privileged-under-privileged social relationship. The systems of jurisprudence often refer to the master-servant doctrine.

The attitude that a Christian should maintain in the midst of a race crisis is no different from the attitude that he should maintain in the absence of a race crisis. The Christians must, in a race crisis or in the absence of a race crisis, cease from doing evil, and continue in doing well. He must seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow. He must preach the gospel to all men. He must always remember that in Christ there "cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Sythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all." (Col. 3:11.) During a period of race crisis, Christians of both races — white and black — are without doubt under spiritual obligation to act, to speak, and to associate with deliberate caution. This they must do so as to refrain from creating unnecessary excitement, race hatred, and confusion.

Followers of Christ must be impressed with the fact that true Christianity will not produce a state of anarchy, or uprising, under any form of government. An evangelist of the gospel when entering a foreign nation or city is under no obligation to change the form of government, the social order or customs, or the economy. In fact he is under obligation to desist from instituting such changes. Paul became all things to all men that he might by all means save some. (I Cor. 9:20-22.) The principles of Christianity can prevail among a people under a monarchial form of government, or an oligarchical form of government, as well as a democratic form of government.

Christians who champion the cause of the NAACP, Dr. Martin Luther King, the race demonstrators, the race rioters, the political opportunists, *et. al.*, are as far removed from the spirit of Christ as are those who champion the cause of the "Negro-haters," the inflamed segregationists, and the cruel and obstinate base fellows. Neither the cause of the anti-segregationist nor the cause of the pro-segregationist can be justified.

The present trend on the part of a segment of gospel preachers and leaders to crusade for the cause of desegregation is contrary to the true spirit of Christianity. In the first place, such a crusade will lend support to those who operate contrary to the spirit of Christ. Much harm and disunity will thus unnecessarily befall the church of the Lord. In the second place, such a crusade reveals an infirmity of attitude relative to the gospel of Christ. The

infirmity is a commitment to a social gospel. It is in actuality an effort to displace the gospel of Christ with a social gospel.

A social gospel is one that has little or no concern for the fundamental doctrines of Christianity but has great concern for the effecting of social, cultural, political, and economical reforms. The modernist is interested only in a social gospel. He believes that so long as the essence of the ethical teaching of Christ is present, Christianity exists, Christ or no Christ. To the modernist, Jesus is God in a sense not radically or essentially different from all men who are of God, and all men can be Christs if they will only follow the ethics of Jesus of Nazareth. Dr. Martin Luther King is a rank modernist, and in the main those white "ministers" who crusade with him are modernists. With them, Christianity consists in bringing about social reforms.

Conversely, the gospel of Christ is concerned with the doctrine that Jesus is the Christ and that he left the glories of heaven to die in the place of man — in the place of man who had violated God's law and deserved to die. Jesus the Christ did not come into the world to change social customs, or to change or implement the form of government, or to raise the cultural pattern, or to raise, for that matter, the standard of living. Jesus came into the world to die in man's place. He came to save man from his sins.

Not only admittedly but also affirmatively, the practice of the principles of Christianity does impinge upon the social, cultural, political, and economical character of a people; but the changes that are brought about are indirect and secondary — the by-products of Christianity. The better way of life is a natural result of the life and mission of Christ.

Let this be understood: Any Christian who feels himself too good to work with or worship with a Negro or Negroes is unworthy of the gospel of Christ. Any Christian that will not help to provide for the spiritual needs of all races within his community is unworthy of Christ, but a Christian who lends his influence to those who lead in race demonstrations, and thus give impetus to race riots and general lawlessness, is certainly far astray from the course set by the apostle Paul. Those who would move Negroes from their own communities into Caucasian communities, and vice versa, so as to have desegregated churches are being ridiculous.

No apology can be offered for the injustices and oppressions that have been pressed upon the Negro race. Such injustices are not common only to the South. Conversely, no apology can be offered for the social and political unrest and outright lawlessness that have been created by the race agitators of our present society. Paul's instructions to "servants" and "masters" are not being followed by either the pro-segregationists or the anti-segregationists. There is definitely a need for humility, respect and love on the part of each. The Christian must do right regardless of what other or others may do.

Mr. Turner (Ed. D., Auburn) is president of Alabama Christian college, Montgomery, Ala.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

BEWARE OF "LIBERALISM"

Stan Paregien

It appears that "liberal" elements are finding lodging places in the Churches of Christ. It is believed that "liberals" can be found in *almost every congregation.* And it has been further revealed that those in this "liberal" classification are well organized: they are joining many congregations, planning to "take over" by infiltration! Brethren, beware of these people. They speak and act convincingly. They are winning many people to their "liberal" views.

You may ask: How can a "liberal" be discovered or identified? He cannot always be discerned readily, but by careful study and investigation you can learn to identify a "liberal" by certain "divisive doctrines" upon which he will build his "case."

"Liberals" believe that the deep, significantly preeminent message of God's new covenant is *love.* They believe that all of life should be interpreted in the light of *love* — love for God, love for fellow men. They take at face value, and believe that Jesus "said what he meant" and "meant what he said," when He voiced the Christian's badge of discipleship: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, that you *love* . . . " St. John, the apostle of love, is believed by "liberals" as he writes, "For the message you have heard from the beginning is this: that we should love one another." (Well, this "love" business is all right, just so it is not run in the ground. They begin with this just to soften you up!)

"Liberals" believe that immersion has a deeper meaning than "humble obedience," and that it is not an act of obedience comparable to Naaman's dipping in the Jordan. They emphasize that baptism, symbolically portraying the Messiah's death, burial, and resurrection, and the candidate's identification with the Christ whom he confesses, points to Jesus as the Savior and Lord. Christian baptism, they claim, has beautiful symbolism and a rich relevance *only* as it points to the Christ, *only* as it becomes a confession of faith in His lordship, *only* as it creates for the individual and experience of dying to the old life and rising to newness of private and public life with Jesus Christ. (Of course, the apostle Paul taught similarly in Romans, chapter six; but in this overly "spiritual" (!) emphasis it is too easy to overlook the *direct command — after* all, Jesus *commanded* it!)

Brethren with "liberal" leanings also concern themselves with so-called "depth" relative to the Lord's Supper. They believe that it is not "enough" to obediently eat crackers and juice fifty-two times annually. The emphasis, they insist, is *not* in consuming

so much unleavened bread and wine each year. They emphasize that a *communion experience* with the living Christ should be realized by each Christian worshiper. They believe that communion in this Sacred Supper should occupy a principal place in the disciples' weekly worship, that it should not be relegated to minor moments in a "*preaching* service." "Participation" or "fellowship" in His sufferings through this communion experience at the Holy Table, they declare, inspires a closer union with the Christ and evokes a more effective Christian witness in daily life. (Of course, the Lord's Supper should not be eaten perfunctorily; but devoting more time in a worship service to this?! robbing the "minister" of his precious moments dedicated to proclaiming the inadequacies of every church but our own?! stripping the "worship" service of its primary *teaching* medium?! This, my brethren, is drifting toward *Rome* and/or *sectarianism!)*

These "liberals" are always concerned about "spiritual" worship. We have not necessarily offered effectual worship, they say, when we have engaged in the well known "five *items* of worship" in the traditional Southern Church of Christ manner. There must be thought and plan to praise and prayer. Periods of true worship should be real seasons of refreshing in joyful communion with God. Worship should be a truly meaningful act because of spiritually discerning planning, spiritually directed services, spiritually sensitive worshipers. Worship, effectually experienced, should be a privilege that bespeaks a most thrilling, most satisfying, and most realistic fellowship awaiting Christians: communion with God. (We really should improve worship services, *to impress the visitors,* but these "liberals" are downright extreme!)

There are other areas of Christian thought which claim the attention of these "liberals" in the Churches of Christ. They emphasize the grace of God in salvation; they stress the personality and ministry of the Holy Spirit in the life and service of the disciple; they speak largely in terms of positive, life-changing Christianity — transformation by the spirit of the Master.

Beware of "liberalism." It might take over the Churches of Christ. "And, Lord, haste the day . . . "!

— *Stan Paregien, Box* 843, *David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn.*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

READING THE PAPERS

Robert Meyers

Much fun is had by writers who lampoon the charitable attitude by asking, "What does it really matter what a man believes? Aren't we all headed to the same place, anyway?" They then say that it makes all the difference in the world what one believes, that character

is determined by what one believes, and that even a sincere man — if he believes the wrong thing — will pay a high price for his error.

Applied to religion, in a certain way, such comments seem to back up Church of Christ authoritarianism. We know that if a man eats poisoned food sincerely believing it to be pure, he gets sick anyway. We know that if he trusts his business partner sincerely, but has the bad luck to be linked to a traitor, he will suffer grievously. Sincerity is not enough, we know, in many areas of life.

The thing that goes wrong with the analogy is the attempt to make it apply too widely. The problem lies in sorting out those things which cause ruin if one's belief about them is erroneous, and those things about which one may be honestly mistaken without ruinous consequences. It is imperative that this distinction be made clear, else we distort and falsify the analogy.

One must try to learn what the essentials of the Christian commitment are, so that his sincere belief in them will lead to the development of mature character. But he will find in this progress that there are many matters of opinion or interpretation about which men are so thoroughly divided —obviously good men, too — that it is clearly not ruinous to be wrong on such points.

To make it more concrete, the child who sincerely believes that gratifying every whim he has is the way to happiness is destined for some terribly unhappy hours. His sincerity will not save him. But the child who has learned better and can live unselfishly, but has accepted his father's notion that all men who use a piano or preach in robes are woefully imperfect, may not be seriously harmed by the latter. He may exhibit in it a quaint provincialism; he may derive a measure of self-satisfaction from his own fancied superiority; but he is not going to come to any tragic consequence because of what I and millions of others would call a misapprehension.

Our constant quarreling about differences of opinion will only be settled, I think, when we agree at last on the bedrock essential of Christian faith. We can probably make a rather sharp line between those who believe in and accept Jesus Christ as the Lord of life and those who reject Him. The thousands of curious niches and odd corners in the building raised upon that foundation need not ruin us. Our minds are strange and they are not alike. Your house may seem quaint indeed to me, bur I shall be happy to find it bedded firmly on faith in Jesus Christ and a sincere attempt to know His will. If I find one of your windows slightly askew, or a brick out of place, I shall regret your failure to construct so perfectly as I have done but I shall not impugn your Christianity.

KNOCKING ON DOORS

A Christian gentleman in a Church of Christ magazine writes on proselyting. He says that it seems to be taboo to most Americans. Knock on doors, offer tracts, try to discuss religious topics and just see what happens, he exclaims. You come away thinking most folks don't appreciate attempts "to convert them to a different religion."

He explains why this is so. The modern "ecumenical craze" is the prime villain. One should observe the semantic game the writer plays. It is not the ecumenical movement, but the "ecumenical craze." The whole thing is belittled and made ridiculous even before he defines it as "the great push toward religious unity." He says that he wants Christian unity, of course, but he argues that the present surge is based on the idea that "it does not matter what you believe."

Apart from the simple fact that the last statement is not true of the ecumenical movement, it leads to distortion. Those with ecumenical spirits do not feel that one belief is as good as another. Why do we go on saying this, unless we are too simple to know better or too warped in spirit to tell the truth? What the ecumenicist really thinks is that belief in Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world is the great uniting belief. *That* belief is better, for them, than any other belief. But within the framework of that commitment, they make room for many differences of opinion about interpretation. They realize that men will not agree on exactly what Jesus meant when he said this, or what his disciples meant when they did that. They feel that many of *these* differences of opinion have not been worth the trouble they have caused in Christendom. They urge men to hold to their distinctive opinions, but to rise above them in loyalty to a common Lord. Calling such views the "ecumenical craze" does not help us much or reflect a sense of responsible journalism.

The writer says that this emphasis on unity, based on its not mattering what one believes, has ruined house-to-house proselyting. Why try to teach anybody anything new? asks the writer. His pose is one of grieved innocence. He is a lamb of helpfulness who has been chased from the door by the wolf of religious apathy. I really think it is better to be quite truthful about what our house-to-house proselyting attempts to do. We are not merely trying to bring new truth; we are trying to lure various kinds of Christians from their respective church folds into our own. We want them in a different camp, a different party. We feel that their interpretations are not only not as good as ours, but that this fact damns them all.

No matter what facade of charitableness he first presents, such a person soon makes his purpose crystal clear. The good Presbyterian, who knows to what degree he honors Jesus as Lord of his life, sees that his visitor is not out to get him introduced to the saving Christ but to get him into the party with the right opinions. His own Christian charity leads him to treat his visitor gently most of the time, but he soon makes it quite clear that he does not

wish to be converted from one Christian group to another. He cannot see why he should. If he asks why he should change, our visiting doorknocker has to drop his evasions and tell him plainly that as a Presbyterian he is going to hell. (And as long as one thinks that way, this is the honest and manly thing to do. I have much more respect for the old fire-eaters who said this than for the mealy-mouthed salesmen of partyism who now use a vocabulary of slick glibness to disguise their sectarianism).

At about this point, the usual technique is to switch over to tales of Jesus and how he went about proselyting. If He did it, so should we, the argument runs. If He wanted to change men's beliefs, so should we. This looks good until one peers at it too closely. Then it falls apart. Certainly Jesus was "the most active Proselytor of all time." But He was *not* knocking on doors trying to get one group of His followers to join another group. He was *not* busy persuading every follower of His to be of unanimous opinion on every conceivable question. He was trying to turn men from inadequate religion to life-giving religion, or from heathenism to the life of Christ-centered faith.

Any disciple of His who goes out in His name to persuade men is following in His steps. But those who knock on doors and try to prove that not using an instrument is the royal road to heaven, or that the fruits of the Spirit only grow on trees that wear proper labels, are doomed to increasing disillusionment. It is true that such proselyting is "socially unacceptable" nowadays, and the trend will increase. *That* kind of proselyting is taboo, and ought to be. — *Friends University, Wichita, Kansas.*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

BOOK NOTES

Several of our readers have already taken advantage of our "Credit Plan" for purchasing books. The plan permits you to order any book that we advertise without any down payment. You will be billed for $5.00 each month if your balance is $50.00 or below, or 10% of the balance if it is above $50.00. We only ask that your balance never exceed $100.00. There are no carrying charges. You pay only the price of the book as we advertise it, plus the nominal postage. This enables our readers to build their library with an outlay of only a few dollars each month. We intend to bring your attention to the best buys in the world of religious books. Here are a few we have available, all of which may be purchased on the "Credit Plan."

American Culture and Catholic Schools by Emmett McLoughlin at $4.95 is as informative as it is controversial. If you want to read a book that says something, you might start here. He draws the curtain on how the Roman Catholic schools are operated: how nuns and priests are recruited, the place of the Bible, how parochial schools are exempt from state control, censorship and the textbooks, how parents have no voice in the conduct of the school. He discusses the sources of Roman Catholic power in politics. It is a fair and honorable treatment of the sensitive areas of education, culture and politics.

Bible Encyclopedia for Children has hundreds of colorful pictures that illustrate the great persons and events of the Bible. It is written in language that can be handled by sixth graders, but not too elementary for children much older, or even for adults. An ideal gift for a child in the middle school years. $3.95.

Anything that C. S. Lewis (recently deceased) wrote is well worth reading —*anything.* Two recent publications are *The Weight of Glory* and *Till We Have Faces*, paperbacks at $1.00 and $1.95 respectively. The first one deals with the problem of pain, evil, the world, the flesh, and the Devil. The other is a symbolic tale on the meaning of love, some believing it his most masterful presentation. We are Lewis fans at our house, even including his books for children, so we'd like to introduce him to you in case you haven't met.

New Testament Times by Merrill C. Tenney at $5.95 is one of those books that one can learn so much from: the history of the age that gave birth to Christianity, cultural tensions, religions of the time, pressures at paganism, social and political frameworks, growth and consolidation of the early church. A solid work and worth the money. Tenney is a conservative scholar who will strengthen your appreciation of the church and the New Testament scriptures.

The New Bible Commentary by Davidson is the work of 50 scholars, and it covers the entire Bible in one volume-and you'll be surprised how much it gets said, providing one with about all he might ever ask about a book of the Bible (the introductions are splendid) or a verse of scripture (it gets right to the point). We sold one of these to a neighbor, and he has since mentioned how very informative it is. Considering it has 1200 pages the price of $7.95 is indeed reasonable. You get several books in one; yet the volume is handsome and easy to handle.

For those who are interested in the famous sets of books we are pleased to inform you that these can be had on the "Credit Plan." Such as *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (five volumes, $35.00); Edersheims Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (two volumes, $8.50); *Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Bible Commentary* (six volumes, $30.00); *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (five volumes, $25.00); *Expositor's Bible* (six volumes, $30.00).

If you want a new Bible, let us supply it for you. For an ideal gift Bible for a child we suggest a Revised Standard Text Bible. They have easy-to-read print, zipper leatheroid covers, and wrapped in cellophane and boxed — a good looking gift for only $5.50 (in *white* for the girls at $6.00). Kids like zippers, but this same Bible without zipper is only $3.50, the best bargain we have; ideal for class work, and suitable for any age. We can put a name in gold on the cover for $1.00 extra. If you want a nice Bible for a loved one, you will have to pay $12.00 up to get the better editions. Write us what you have in mind, and we will advise.

Faith on Trial by Martyn Lloyd-Jones is a book of meditations on Psalms 73. We need to do more devotional reading, and here is a place to start. Dr. Lloyd-Jones is a physician as well as a theologian, preaches at Westminster Chapel in London. He writes about *joy. $2.95.*

If you are interested in gathering commentaries on Old Testament books, we suggest The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Start with Young's *The Book of Isaiah,* Vol. 1, at $7.95. You can add others. We also can supply the *Anchor Bible. Genesis* is $6.00, *Jeremiah* is $7.00. These are very handsome volumes and the latest work in scholarship. The New International series is more conservative and less technical than the *Anchor Bible,* but the latter is first-class stuff, with a new translation.

A MATTER OF RECORD

There is now available a 33 1/3 rpm long playing record by W. Carl Ketcherside on *Who Is My Christian Brother?* It is a production of high quality and is attractively packaged. It is 50 minutes in length in brother Ketcherside's own voice. The price is $4.95 plus 25 cents postage, and you may order from this office.

This new recording by a very able advocate of a broader fellowship among all disciples should be part of the answer to the question we often hear, *What can I do?* Since many people have a record-player, this would be a splendid way for them to hear a discourse on unity in their own homes. Simply lend them the record, explaining that you think it might mean as much to them as it has to you. Or invite a group into your home for a coke and a cookie, play the record, and invite discussion. It would be ideal for young people's gatherings.

Sir Oliver Lodge expressed the wish that we might have truce of fifty years in scientific discover, in order to give man a last chance to raise his moral standard to the stature of these terrific discoveries and energies. — *Leslie Weatherhead*

Those in the Dallas area are invited to a series of studies on “Problems of the Christian” presented by Leroy Garrett at Wynnewood Chapel, 2303 S. Tyler, Dallas. Sessions each Wednesday at 7:30 through Nov. 24. Topics include *Problem of Living With Self, Problem of Living With Others, Problem of Living in a Secular World, Problem of Suffering, Problem of Old Age and Death.*

Will you help us circulate this journal? Many of our readers are saying that we are doing a work that needs to be done. If this is true, we invite you to help us. Subscribe for someone else, or better still, send a list of names. Or order a bundle each month, at ten cents each, and hand them to concerned people. We will send a sample copy to any name you send us.

Back copies are available at ten cents each (monthly issues) and 3 for $ 1.00 (quarterly issues). Subs $1 yearly; 50 cents in clubs of six or more.

Restoration Review, *1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas 76201.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*